ECUMENICAL COUNCIL IN THE NETHERLANDS

Commission for study of the subjects proposed for discussion at the Oxford Conference of 1937.

COMMUNICATIONS

OVER

I. Church and Community.

II. Church and State.

III. Church, Community and State in relation to the Economic Order.

IV. Church, Community and State in relation to Education.

V. The Universal Church and the World of Nations.

Br
280.242
E 92 c

LIBRARY
World Council of Churches
17, route de Malagnou, GENEVA

LIBRARY OF THE
WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

BIBLIOTHÈQUE
DU CONSEIL ŒCUMÉNIQUE

This book must be returned not later than
Ce livre doit être rendu au plus tard à la date
inscrite ci-après

1430

Br 280.242
E 92c

ECUMENICAL COUNCIL IN THE NETHERLANDS

Commission for study of the subjects proposed for discussion at the Oxford Conference of 1937.

COMMUNICATIONS

OVER

I Church and Community.

II Church and State.

III Church, Community and State in relation to the Economic Order.

IV Church, Community and State in relation to Education.

V The Universal Church and the World of Nations.

...RY
World Council of Churches
150, route de Ferney, GENEVA

MEMORANDUM

of a Commission set up by the Ecumenical Council in the Netherlands, for study of the subjects proposed for discussion at the Oxford Conference of 1937.

INTRODUCTION.

The crisis into which modern life in all its aspects has entered raises, with renewed emphasis, the question of the position of Christ's Church on earth and of the task of Christians in this world. It is realised more and more that the acute crisis of to day, is really the continuation and ultimate consequence of one which has, for centuries, been latent.

In the Middle Ages Roman Catholic scholasticism, in the spirit of Greek philosophy, separated the spiritual from the natural in life, only to bring them later into relation with each other again, in accordance with the entelechie of Aristotle. In this system good works were regarded as one of the conditions for obtaining eternal salvation. In it, likewise, the Church held a hierarchical position over against all other powers in human life.

As against this, the Reformation, in conformity with the Bible, brought full acceptation of life on earth as God's creation, whereby good works were counted to be the fruit of thankfulness, without which there could be no salvation (Calvin). The Reformation has placed the Church

not only above, but equally in the midst of the world, in which it is called to preach the coming of God's Kingdom and to be the witness of His will. From this starting point the position was not in every domain completely maintained. Lutheranism, for various reasons, among which was its particular system of doctrine, placed the church as regards earthly affairs, in a dependent position towards the State. Among certain sections of Calvinists, works -contrary to fundamental Calvinistic doctrine- were in practice not infrequently cut off from their own mother soil and, in personal struggle for power, became secularised.

Thus, though there were in the development of Christianity itself certain elements tending to secularism, these elements were considerably re-inforced through a humanistic trend of thought, which, following many paths, came into touch with Christian teahhing and life. Here we have not in view Christian humanism; that developed on its own lines.

However, when the humanistic ideal of free personality and that of the continuity of scientific thought were cut away from the Christian order -Creation, Preservation, Redemption -they took a course, which was on the one hand alien, even sometimes hostile to Christian thought and life, or, on the other, forced their way into that thought and life itself. In like manner the theory of evolution developed in a direction which often led far from Christianity.

These ideals or conceptions as so conceived thrust into the background the foundations of a specifically Christian attitude to life, that is, of a share in the promises of God's Kingdom and of submission to His judgment - in one sphere of life after the other. This exclusive humanism, in a great

process of secularization,has substituted its own ideals for those of Christianity,as well as itself penetrating the latter.This process still goes on.Now we may certainly expect as one of the important results of renewed ecumenical discussion,that exclusively humanistic learning will at last be dislodged from its well-nigh monopolistic position.

It is however by no means only in the realm of science that secularism has penetrated.This has also taken place in the political life of nations,in the economic and social life of individuals,in education and in international collaboration.Individualism,extending its power over all sides of life,may be regarded very particularly as one of the bitter fruits of rational secularism.

In this order of things the Church was more and more driven back upon the care of individual souls.The „separation of Church and State",theoretically proclaimed in the name of toleration,often signified,on the Continent,the last manifestation,practically speaking,of a long process of de-Christianization in all fields of life,exeept in the inner life of those who were still in touch with the Church.As against this,it is to be noted that,especially in Anglo-Saxon countries,the separation of Church and State is regarded as a valuable asset,precisely because such separation sets the Church free to state her own claims in social and political life.

We are far from wishing to say by this that secularism, however destructively it has worked and still works,has not done much,in practice,which should have been done by Christians.On the contrary.But many un-Christian things have also been done in the spirit of secularism.The double atti-

tude of humanism towards Christianity -which has already been cited - on the one hand alien or even hostile to Christian thought and life, on the other hand linking itself up with it, proves that even that which can be looked upon as a Christian duty is often dearly bought with the crowding out of Christian conviction.

In the Netherlands the „Réveil" has contributed much towards stopping the unlimited growth of secular virus. Its forerunner (Bilderdijk, the poet and philosopher), its most outstanding figures (da Costa, de Clercq, Groen van Prinsterer), as well as those who, like Heldring, in the spirit of philantropy, continued to build on the foundations laid by the Réveil, must have honourable mention here. The Réveil, which, in the Netherlands, was very manysided in character, has also made a very deep mark on the political life of the last hundred years.

Now, gradually, the process of secularisation has exhausted itself in the Western world, and that in proportion to the extent to which practically all spheres of life had submitted to its rule. Now, unfortunately, it has not been the Christian faith that, at this critical moment, has been able to renew with its strength the life that had become emptied of faiht. Rather, it has been new myths and ideologies which, particularly since the Great War, have laid hold of the masses. Social life, from which, above all in the great countries of Europe, Christian faith had already to a great extent retreated, and which was torn into bits by individualism, fell an easy prey to totalitarian views, generally completely „diesseitig".

It needs no evidence to show that these trends of

thought presented problems to Christian faith and practice much intenser and more acute than the growth of secularism. Taking its stand as a new, albeit entirely „diesseitiges" belief, these views as a rule could not share their influence with that of the Christian faith and were thus obliged to be, on principle, intolerant and even militant. Secularism had been dangerous in quite another way, because through it and precisely in the name of tolerance the life of Christianity had been, very slowly, sapped from within.

The same double attitude towards Christianity that we have noticed in the case of secularism appears also however in that of these „diesseitige" views of today. On the one hand they cut themselves loose from, indeed are often hostile to Christian thought and life, on the other they themselves penetrate that thought and life. In the face of the totalitarian thesis the renewal of ecumenical discussion has given us a very special task to fulfil as well in the domain of politics in each nation and of the nations as in the economic and social life of all sections of the people and likewise in education. In particular the subjection of the individual to exclusive social myths is one of the bitter fruits of the tendency of these „diesseitige" beliefs. International cooperation is more and more endangered through the unlimited will to power of the authoritarian State. Along with this, the problem of the community has, since the coming into being of these new tendencies, become a very urgent one for Christianity, which it never became so long as secularism held sway.

The Church in this order of things is not merely driven back into the sphere of care for the individual soul,

but is attacked at its source by these political philosophies whose views of life are limited to this world.

Here also we would be the last to deny that the „diesseitige" beliefs, however destructively they may go to work, have not done much, in practice, which should have been done by Christians. Yet, whilst their practical work has sometimes been in accord with Christian love, it has often not been so and, in any case, has frequently demanded as its price the acceptance of principles which are in conflict with Christianity.

This double undermining of Christianity by secularism and by „diesseitige" tendencies brings home to Christians with poignant emphasis their shortcomings in fundamental principles and in practice. In the first place, it will be necessary for the practice of the Christian life, to consider the Church's attitude towards the five factors in life already named; namely Community, State, the Economic Order, Education and International Relations. A modest step in this direction is taken in the following memorandum on the five subjects of the Oxford Conference. These were discussed in detail by the Commission for special study, appointed by the Ecumenical Council in the Netherlands, after which Dr. J.A. de Koning, Prof. Dr. P. Scholten, Prof. Dr. P. Lieftinck, Prof. Dr. Ph. Kohnstamm and Dr. J.C. Baak have contributed a special study of each subject, edited by dr. Baak, who has written this preface to them, and which study was finally accepted by the Commission. In these contributory studies, those on „Church and State", „Church and Education" their authors are able to draw upon the long experience that the Netherlands, in particular, have had in these problems. Compared with these

studies on „Church and Community", „Church and the Economic Order" and „The Una Sancta and the World of Nations" have a more general character. It is remarkable that practically all these contributory studies agree in their definition of the position of the Church towards practical problems. This position is not so envisaged as that the Church should limit itself to general principles and leave the faithful to work them out, but rather that the Church is justified in letting her testimony be heard with regard to all issues general or special, provided that she does not thereby encroach on the ground of the technical expert. Work on this ground should be the task of individual believers, who, however, making up as they do the community of the faithful, constitute a part of the Church. The Church as an Institution must always keep clear of expert technical matters, as also of direct political influence or of any political power at all.

Yet, in our times, our faith as Christians can only bear fruit if we, in and above these scientific considerations, answer to its call and rise to our vocation. We must not try to avoid searching questions, as, for instance, that which asks why the world had need of non-Christian principles in order to bring to pass things that Christians themselves should have done. Or, in like manner, why the faithful, more often than not, fall a prey to extremist tendencies, whilst the salt of the earth, as a rule, has lost its savour. The most painful question of all is that which asks why, believing fully as we do, that the truth is given to us by God in Christ, our lack of faith is yet so great that we, having this truth, can do so little in practice. Humble prayer alone befits us, seeing the work with which God has charged us.

SECTION I

CHURCH AND COMMUNITY.

1. The Church binds together its members into one people of God,having part in the salvation which is His gift ,and thus accepting His commands.This one people of God knows itself to be one in spite of and above the variety of nations.

2. It is the Church's obligation to bear ever in mind its task towards all nations.For the Church no nation or section of a nation is of more or less worth than another nation or section of a nation.

3. The Church proclaims the Kingdom of God as a promise and as a claim on all in their personallife,in the life of groups and of society in general,in national life and the life between nations.The Church is absolute in its preaching of salvation through Christ alone.Every view of life and the world which does not stand for Christ as its highest good is inacceptable to it.

   Obedience to God's commandments presupposes in itself acceptance of His sovereignty over the life between nations and over the single nation.The life of individual peoples equally with that of the nations as a whole stands under His will.The Church must labour unceasingly to bring them all into obedience to Him.

4. The relation between Church,nation and nations can,owing to its demand for complete obedience to the commandments of God,only be one of great tension.Its work must be fortiter in re,suaviter in modo.It is for the Church to achieve it by placing itself under the supreme leadership of Christ's will.

5. The Church may not seek to lessen this tension by subordi-

nating its leadership and organization to the Community or even the state.Fundamentally the Church does not exist for the sake of the Community nor the Community for the Church, but both have to obey Christ,and may the supreme command for the Church be that Christ's will be done in all things and at all times and no measures taken by the organised Community may hinder its freedom to give this testimony.

6. Seeing that,in the nineteenth century,individualism had full sway in every direction,the Church at that time,could have little eye for the necessities and desires of the Community as a whole and was obliged to devote its powers chiefly to the care of individual souls.In the Netherlands an important exception to this rule was formed by the countless activities of Christian philanthropy which,as a fruit of the Réveil,were from the middle of the century onwards undertaken by many believers with increasingly fruitful results.

7. Driven by the necessitous times,broken adrift from the anchorage of Christian principles - and for this the Church must share the blame - psychologically prone to radicalism and nihilism,the masses of the people give themselves up readily to myths and ideas which in their totality make demands and take forms which give them the suggestion of entire emancipation.Included in this is a one-sidedly consistent extension of one of the formative elements of national unity into a complete philosophy of life and the world.This,in turn leads to a demand for the entire surrender of the personality, inclusive of its moral and religious life, to this philosophy of life and the world. An absorption of the whole life, personal and social, bodily

as well as spiritual, for the service of the highest good as postulated in these myths and ideas, is the consequence. Seeing that the Church can only accept as norm God's will and command it is its duty to take a stand in opposition to such tendencies.

8. For the Church to exercise moral influence, in the Christian sense, demands, in these times, very particular and lasting study and organization in ecumenical union. Strong and inspired work on the part of the Churches in the whole realm of cultural life is needful, if social standards are to retain their Christian character. The Church must be alive to the fact that its work, in this respect, can only be fruitful if it is supported by the personal faith of its members. Therefore the methods it employs must be calculated to strengthen this faith and to encourage its expression in works.

9. The way in which the Chruch has to fulfil its task will vary in the case of each people. It must not lose sight of the fact that its members belong to a social community, one of other communities, each with its own nature and its own cultural task. The Church must not try to loosen the bonds that tie its members to their own community. On the contrary, it must ever bear in mind its particular task for each separate community without thereby prejudicing the unity of the whole Church over all the nations. The Churches must keep their eyes open to the difficulties which the Churches in other countries have to overcome in fulfilling their task so that unity may not be broken by mutual misunderstandings.

SECTION II

CHURCH AND STATE

The collision between Church and State is as old as the centuries. That, in the 19th and in the beginning of the 20th century, it was but latent does not speak for the strength of the Church's life at that period. The relation between the two must be one of tension. On the one hand, the State is always, for the Church, that ordering of life of which it acknowledges the necessity. On the other, that ordering, the State, always tends to cut itself loose from the Church, being at the same time the world to which it (the Church) stands opposed.

This opposition existed during the whole of the Middle Ages (cf. the doctrine of the two swords); it was accentuated when the Reformation came and disrupted the Church; it still continued during the period of toleration which followed. To confine ourselves to the Netherlands - it was still present in the 17th century. The Reformed Church was a State Church; in its Confession of Faith it established on a firm basis the position of Government and pointed out its task - even in matters of religion; but at the same time it was the State which had decided that the Reformed Church should be the State Church. When the government of a State arrogates to itself the authority to decide which Church must be regarded as the true Church, then the authority of government at the same time extends over the inner life of the Church. Herein lies the germ of a struggle which continued throughout the 17th and 18th centuries and in which the State without any doubt has been the victor. Its own independent position made it possible for the government, besides protec-

ting the Reformed Church-which it had declared to be the true one- to tolerate other Churches as well;and this toleration could be a putting them,practically speaking,on the same level.

Thus,when by the French Revolution the transition,whose preparation was begun by the theories of the 18th century, was finally consummated by the creation of the non-Christian State,this transition was for the Netherlands not entirely new inasmuch as the State,for centuries past,had of its own will delimited its position with regard to the Church.

In the Batavian Republic the Reformed Church ceased to be a State Church.It became as the other Churches a religious community,more important for the State but otherwise not different in character to any other association for ideal ends.It is true that this equality of status was not carried out entirely in practice;something of its (the Reformed Church's) peculiar character always remained;in financial relations what was peculiar to it and which it had won by its history was recognised.But in principle it was neither more nor less than a religious community .

This also was the liberal idea,which dominated the intellectual life of the Netherlands in the 19th century.It was held by that great liberal Thorbecke.It has remained the basis of the relations between Church and State in the Netherlands up to the present time.

The State,then,is the only real ordering of society, an ordering which,individualistic in its form,allows to each one as much freedom as possible with regard to his convictions,including his religious convictions.The fetters of the State must be felt as little as possible.Indivi-

dually one is free to profess whatever faith one believes it to be ones duty to profess;one is also free to take part in the joint practice of religious observances-yet there is no place for a Church in the real meaning of the word . In the Netherlands the Church,individualistic as it has become,has contented itself with this position.I say the Church,but perhaps I ought really to say the Churches,for it is characteristic of this conception of things that in it there are Churches,several of them side by side equal both in their relation to the State and to each other.The variety of religious conviction thus becomes a desirable thing of great value;unity however is lacking;there is affinity,but nothing more.

Yet the Liberal period was not lacking in attempts at synthesis.Thorbecke of whom mention has already been made,was not in the least an advocate of the non-Christian State.He sought for harmony between a Liberal State and Christian popular conviction in an undogmatic „Christianity above the divisions of creeds".It was notably in the State schools,that this „Christianity above the divisions of creeds" was to find its expression.

Against this attempt at synthesis opposition was set up from left and right alike.From the left because there the State's neutrality was looked on as desirable and therefore as to be maintained in its schools.From the right because there men were not content with the teaching of an undogmatic Christianity in the State schools- a Christianity so undogmatic that it was often reduced to a system of morality. Nevertheless ,the degree to which Liberal ideas had permeated men's minds was clearly shown by

the numberless points of view which in Christian circles were adopted regarding this new conception of the neutral State. These points of view ranged from the entire rejection of this conception to, practically, its acceptance; in the latter case with the guarantee of freedom for the Christian section of the people to have its own schools, political parties and associated life and to develop them as far as possible. This meant, as regards the schools, putting the special Christian schools both Protestant and Roman Catholic in principle and as to their finance on an equal footing with the neutral State schools, a footing which the Protestant political parties under the leadership of Groen van Prinsterer and later that of Kuyper in cooperation with the Roman Catholic State Party -(de Savornin Lohman has in this matter rendered the greatest services) - have won after a struggle of half a century or more.

This is not the place to deal more fully with the question of the position of the Protestant political parties in the Netherlands. But we would like to emphasise the fact that the great Protestant parties, the one more the other less, and not without a great deal of oscillation, have each adopted one or another idea of Liberal origin. In saying this we must however also allow for another and contributory fact, namely that secularism had become very wide spread and that through its influence increasingly large circles had withdrawn from the Church, both the Church and the preaching of the Gospel were thereby affected, and the Church felt itself to be placed in minority position. It is however precisely because of this growing secularism that it seems increasingly less possible to stop at a sort of division

of spheres of influence between the neutral State and the Christian groups. But has this perception in the Netherlands reached so far that one can speak of a change of course and, with it, of a new sense of the relation of Church to State? Certainly not, in the sense that this problem will be solved by State intervention in the internal affairs of the Church; rather the obvious temptation is that in view of the growing secularization of public and private life, Christian circles will turn to the State for the protection of their religion. This course however may not without serious consideration be regarded as acceptable, for reasons both of principle and practice.

The only other solution would be that the Church itself took the problem in hand . Therefore it is clear that we are faced with a fundamental decision. Is the State or is the Church to be entrusted with the struggle in the spiritual crisis of our times? If we choose the latter path then we recognise by implication that the Church is still something other and more than an association of people who think alike on matters of religion, or an institution for the care of individual souls and, thereby, feel it possible that it may at any moment be called upon to maintain its own character. Moreover, the Church is again beginning to realise - it is not more than a beginning - that it may be its duty in virtue of the authority that has been given to it, to speak its mind about political and social questions.

If one asks for an indication of the lines of this new realization, they are in our view as follows :

1. The Church can never teach <u>in abstracto</u> and still less <u>in concreto</u> what is the duty of the State. The Gospel is not-

SECTION III

CHURCH, COMMUNITY AND STATE IN RELATION TO THE ECONOMIC ORDER.

1. The struggle, which is now taking place in most countries, to find a solution to the problem of community and state jointly, in relation to the economic order must, in the opinion of this commission, be regarded as in the main a reaction against the predominance during the last half century of the doctrine of economic freedom; which doctrine claimed, for every individual, freedom in the use of such wealth as was at his disposal, making him at the same time responsible for his own economic existence and leaving the interests of the community to the free plan of forces being themselves the result of the economic motive in the domain of satisfaction of material needs, and to the results of this free play of forces. With the claims of Christ an apparent synthesis was arrived at. Liberalism deliminating sharply the spheres of action of the homo religiosus, the homo politicus and the homo economicus in such a way as to leave economics to an a- or anti-Christian „Eigergesetzlichkeit".

2. The predominance of this doctrine favoured by a number of circumstances characteristic of the last century -(the rapid progress of science and technical development, the discovery and utilization of rich new sources of prosperity, great increase of population)- all contributed to a considerable rise in material prosperity, but on the other hand led to a concentration of man's interest on economic questions and to a struggle dominating everything else in life to such an extent, that, under modern conditions, the human side of life is lost sight of, whilst there is no

community of interest more direct or with more influence than that which goes out from the solidarity of men's common interest in the stockmarkets.

3. Neither State nor Church have during the period already referred to, offered resistance of any strength or effectiveness to the dehumanizing and disintegrating influence of these doctrines of freedom on modern economic development. Their activity has in the main been limited to alleviating some of its most serious results and checking some of its worst developments. There has been in the Church a practically entire lack of driving-power and leadership in the strife for a better social and economic order. It is true, that a few Christian statesmen (in our country for instance Dr. A. Kuyper) - have made a stand for a more organic social order, but State and Church as such have held aloof. (The Roman Catholic Church with its encyclicals Rerum Novarum and Quadragesimo Anno form an exception to this rule). It has been the labour movement, both in its socialistic and in a milder way its Christian-Social groups, that has offered opposition to the domination of individualist economics. It has been the small group of Christian-Socialists which has helped to bridge the gulf between Christianity and the further development of economic relations. The principles for which the labour movement stood , have meanwhile had adequate support neither from State nor Church and have been unable to acquire a preponderant influence.

At the present time, the rule of the doctrine of economic freedom is threatened by those totalitarian theories of the State which in some countries have already come in-

to their own and have extended their influence into economic life. Meanwhile it is extremely open to doubt, whether here also the human will not be just as much crushed by the economic factor as under the old system and whether here also true community of interests in economic relations can be reached.

4. In the struggle already referred to it will be for the Church to keep in the foreground the broad conception that economics in relation to human aims, both individual and social, must be servant not master. This does not imply denial of the great significance of the economic factor in productive work of the development of the conditions necessary to human life and civilization. But it does imply a strong reproof of the moral disruption which gives the primacy to economic values, and it also implies the rejection of a system of social organization in which these values, as such, are put in the place of honour.

5. Further, it must be clearly stated that we must strive for the realization of a social and economic order which does justice to the mutual relation of men as Gods creatures. This involves that the central position in economic life ultimately belongs to man as such and not to the State, the race or the mass (as an impersonal collective entity). Seeing, however, that man, throughout his life, pursues his ends in and through the community of the people to which he belongs, the social and economic order which serves a human end must also be conditioned by this same community, which established it. In this the vital interests of other communities or nations much also be considered.

6. It follows from the foregoing that the social-economic or-

der for which we must strive, cannot be the same for all times, places and conditions. At the same time it shuts out the possibility that one order more than the other should claim the exclusive name of „Christian". It is however true that, given certain conditions, one more than the other, will be better fitted to play its part of service to the ends already spoken of.

7. The Church must refrain from declaring its solidarity with a given social and economic order. Co-incident with its task of preaching, must be carried out those moral principles which apply not only to individuals but also to society.

8. As to what is the function of the State in relation to these problems , the commission feels that responsibility for achieving that social and economic order which might most be desired, does not lie with trade and industry alone. Government has here a task and responsibility of its own. Any action on its part must however both lead and at the same time be supported by the rational and moral conviction of the people.

9. In the Draft Report are given as examples two deeply felt objections regarding the existing economic order, objections which the Christian community will have to consider. One is the meaninglessness of the work itself and, therewith , of the daily life of the worker. The other is the propertyless condition of the masses in face of monopolies, holding in their hands both income and economic power threatening all human fellowship and imperilling social justice. In the opinion of this commission a third example should be expressly mentioned namely, the lack of direction or standard in competitive strife, with its consequence

in economic and, above all, in moral disruption. Existing measures against dishonest competition are still, often, no more than the fixing of certain minimum limits beyond which it cannot go without coming into conflict with the penal judge. Within these limits however moral standards are to be found. Moreover on the raising of the moral standard in competition will not infrequently depend the possibility of better conditions for the workers and the creation of new methods of organization by which the contrasts between classes and groups can be lessened.

10. The question might be considered whether in the Draft Report a too one-sided diagnosis is not made of the causal relation between the modern development of economic life, with its dehumanising and disintegrating social effects, and Western man's aversion to the Christian faith in that the ultimate cause of the latter is sought for in the former.

Should not the cause rather be sought - in part if not entirely - in the ill balanced development of the different cultural powers (spiritual and intellectual) which are the controlling element in individual and social life alike-an ill balanced development which must revenge itself in proportion to the increased pace of economic development?

Not long since Sir Josiah Stamp in a lecture delivered before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, pointed to the phenomenon that „the concepts of theology and ethics, the tradition of the law, all tend to lag seriously behind changes brought about through science, technical affairs and general economic life". One might put it also in this way that spiritual and moral thought (and will) has not been equal to this rapid economic development with

behind it the driving power of two centuries of scientific discovery.

From the point of view of faith we must certainly give the name of sin to this spiritual impotency. In the first place it is the Church's sin who has allowed its hold on the masses to be loosened and has, to a great extent, lost its influence in economic and social relations because, in many respects, its theology and ethics have been in arrears of developments in natural science and in the technical sphere. This should make the Church, above all, humble in face of the non-Christian ideologies and movements which aim at a reform of economic and social life and are more in harmony with the dynamic forces of today.

But, besides this also, the situation demands from the Church a strong concentration on these same problems; because humanly speaking it will depend on the message which it will deliver with regard to them, whether, in that reform of economic and social life which is a necessity for the future, Christianity is to be passed by or is to permeate it with its eternal principles.

SECTION IV

CHURCH, COMMUNITY AND STATE IN RELATION TO EDUCATION.

1. It has been shown with sufficient clearness, in the Introduction and in the treatment of the material of some of the foregoing Sections that the daemonic power of sin, which dominates all human activities, results, of necessity, in tendencies on the part of individuals and small groups or sects, on the one hand, to strive for their own selfish ends and, thereby, disintegrate society, and, on the other, in an attitude of the State which, on the contrary, would deny the rights of the individual and thus would tend to the forming of the authoritarian and absolute State.

We need only to speak here of the consequences of both tendencies in so far as they affect education and educationel ideals. Twice in its history, Dutch Christianity - perhaps more deeply than any other part of the Una Sancta - has been brought into contact with these consequences and these two occasions have to a great extent given a definite form to the ideals of education and to the practical prganization of teahhing in our country. We refer 1. to the menace of foreign violence in the 80 Years War of Liberation out of which the Netherlands people and state have been born and 2. the menace of internal violence in a struggle, also lasting for about 80 years and out of which and in aversion to the supremacy of the state has resulted through mutual deliberations, a delimiting of the rights of State, family and Church in matters of education.

Since history and tradition have exercised so clearly marked an influence in the forming of the Community of

the Netherlands,so,partly owing to our geographical position as a small people surrounded by three big neighbours,to each of whom we owe much andto the oft repeated inclusion in our community of foreign refugees who have sought and found safe refuge in the Netherlands,have the daemonic forces which lie in „the myth of race" had much less reality in our every day life than has the „myth of the State".Hence,in our teaching and education hardly any attention has been given towarding off the danger of race-glorification.In what follows,likewise,this subject will not be discussed farther.

2. The defining of limits to the competences of the different personal or institutional factors in education has taken place in this way that the family has ,in principle,been acknowledged as coming first,and,in relation to it,all others likewise concerned (namely State,Church,School, Youth Movements)merely exercise their functions derivitively) we may say that this conception is not only held without exeption as a norm in the Christian part of our population but that it is beyond their limits only rejected by small bodies of extremists [1].

Note 1.There is much less concurrence about general principles in the educationel system of the Netherlands Indies than there is in that of the Netherlands itself,with regard to which we must bear in mind that,in the former case,education has to be carried out among a preponderatingly non-Christian population.

Many - and precisely in missionary circles - are of opinion that in the education of children the tie between them and their parents must be respected as so sacred that no child must be influenced against the will or intentions of its parents,however much this task may be,thereby,complicated with regard to a primitive population.As against this the thesis is surely as often defended that it is the duty of the Government of Netherlands India,as a Christian government,to further Christianity by subsidising Christian schools,even where the parents only conform to the situation for the sake of social advantage.Precisely on account of this fundamental difference of opinion,we will not here enter further into the question of education in Netherlands India.There is general agreement only on one point - and that is regulated by law - namely that in places

3. Consequent on the foregoing ,the State,in our educational system,has merely the duty of promoting education in so far as it is a direct preparation for social life (The formation of the intellect,generally speaking,and professional training).Therefore it is not active in the field of education outside the limits of school(as in the Youth Movements), but principally by creating forms of organization and by the provision and control of finances.It has no say as regards denominational theories of education,anyhow in the case of the greater number of schools (attended by about 2/3 of Dutch school children) which are governed by bodies independent of - though their costs under certain conditions are defrayed by - the State.These are the so-called special schools.The remaining 1/3 of the children attend the schools established by the municipal governments (local authorities).

The fact that every group of parents,always provided that the number of its children who are of age to attend school be not altogether too small,can form a school of their own at government expense,makes a very serious appeal to the sense of responsibility and the good citizenship of these parents. For the temptation to misuse their freedom to establish such schools is obvious and there is an open field for that evil spirit of egoistic individualism and sectional self interest that has already been discussed in No.1. of this Section. Only a people of very strong self-discipline can operate such a system entirely without fault

---

where no other school exists,children attending the mission schools are not obliged to participate in religious instruction or worship, if this be against the wishes of the parents.

and we will not maintain that this has been the case in our country. Apart from such faults as we envisage the system almost shuts out the possibility of schools large enough to take several hundred children and with this fact are connected many problems of organization, financial problems among them. We give for your consideration, in the Appendix, a summary of the costs of education per child, as compared with those of other countries.

In the „special" schools already mentioned, religious education - as may be inferred from what has already been said - is regulated entirely by the governing bodies of the schools, in accordance with their own religious convictions. Government provides no religious teaching in its schools whilst teachers are forbidden, under penalty of dismissal to teach, do, or allow anything that is contrary to the respect due to the religious opinions of others. There has been much conflict of opinion as to the exact meaning of this regulation. In the 19th century the interpratation usually given to it was that the teacher must keep silence over any point involving religious convictions, and thus, for instance, should, on these grounds, even avoid the names of Christ and God. This was certainly not the original intention, which, in the long run, has been kept to. It is now generally recognised that the regulation does not imply more than it actually says, namely, that religious opinions even when one does not agree with them, must always be spoken of with respect.

Thus the teacher in government schools is free to speak of his own faith provided he does not let his utter-

ance develop into systematic religious teaching, for that is left to the Church and to religious societies. Thesehave the right to give religious instruction in the schools and within school hours. It is however the parent's affair and not that of the school to prescribe whether these lessons are to be attended or not. In the majority of schools the Church makes use of this right, and thereby reaches about half of that 1/3 of the school-going population which attends the government schools. Since the „special" schools are, with vanishing exceptions, Protestant or Roman Catholic, it follows that about 1/6 of the elementary school population fails to receive religious teaching. Christian specialists in education differ in their appraisal of the government schools as compared with the special schools. Whilst by far the most of them regard it as a self-evident duty that children of Christian parents should attend Christian schools, there is a minority which setsless value on the school for the teaching of religion, provided always that parents and Church fulfil their duty in this respect. They uphold the mixed schools of the government for so long, anyhow, as a common moral tradition has hold in our country, on the ground that children should learn when young that, in this mixed society, they must associate with others besides Christians, and also in order to counteract the danger of a complete de-Christianising of the government schools. What we have been saying concerns primary education (elementary schools) which in our country covers from 6 to 7 years of school life. For continued education (secondary schools) regulations differing to a certain

extent are in force, but in the main, conditions are not fundamentally other than those obtaining in the elementary schools.

4. Thus, whilst the State in the Netherlands has no noticeable influence on education outside the school, and relatively little on school education itself, the influence especially the indirect influence of the Church is, on the contrary, very great. On the one hand this is owing to the Christian family, which we may indeed always regard as a part of the Church, and, on the other, to the members and officials of the Church, whose influence preponderates in the governing bodies of the schools and associations for work among the young. The whole field is thus prescribed through the concurrence existing between family influence and that of the other factors in education.

On the other hand the direct influence of the Church, as such and through its functionaries, is, in the main, confined to the teaching of the catechism (preparation of the young for admission to Church membership) and to optional religious teaching in the Government schools, as described in note 2.

Note 2. In this connection we are reminded, for example, of, sentence in the preface of G. Bohne's book „Das Wort Gottes und der Unterricht". He says: „Before the war our education was coherent and was based on the conviction that in the Neo-Humanism the schools a real unity of Christianity and culture had been attained". In our country owing to the struggle for a Christian school, we have been protected from such curious illusions moreover, it would appear from this quotation that we are to understand the world humanism, as used in the text, to mean an outlook on life and the world such as that of the Renaissance and of German idealism, which is based on the assumption of the so-called autonomy of man. We do not mean to deny that humanism can also be spoken of in another sense; in our country, for example, there have always been so many points of contact between Christian conviction and certain currents of thought which might also be called „humanistic" that a well known Dutch book was devoted to the subject of Biblical humanism. But this is not the place to pursue the subject further.

5. This influence of the Church which is, relatively speaking, very strong over the whole field of education, has, nevertheless not been able to prevent the progress of secularization, the signs of which are clearly evident even in our country, though somewhat less so than in many other parts of Europe. That the influence of secularization is not so preponderant here as elsewhere, may probable be ascribed in part to the struggle for a Christian school mentioned in 1. For not only has this prevented that teachers who were not followers of Christ should be charged by the State with the teaching of religion, but it has also counteracted very strongly that blurring of the limits between humanism and Christianity, which elsewhere has shown itself to be so powerful a forerunner of the new forms of religion now arising in the world.

From our own experience in the Netherlands we would therefore emphasise most strongly that the counteracting force against secularization must and can be that of the Church and its confessing servants and members alone. In no case may a partly or wholly secularised State be entrusted with a missionary task for which it is once and for all unsuited. This applies a fortiori if, in lending its support to one or the other form of „Christianity", it would further its own interests or opinions, not the coming of God's Kingdom.

6. We hope it will be sufficiently clear from the foregoing, that in our country opinion is practically unanimous as to the necessity in education -(using the word in its widest sense) - of a strict difference being made between 1. The formation of character and, above all, the religious

training of the young being the kernel of the matter;2. general intellectual development and preparation for participating in general culture;and 3.preparation for taking a place in social production and the practice of a profession.

The Dutch language has three words which keep these three ideas entirely distinct from each other.The word for 1.(opvoeding)=education in the more restricted sense of the word, one might perhaps render best as religious and moral education or respectively„Religiöse Erziehung und Charakterbildung";that for 2.(onderwijs)as teaching or instruction (Allgemeine Bildung);that for 3.(opleiding)by vocational training (Berufsbildung oder Fachaushildung).Opinion is unanimous that State interference must be confined to 2 and 3;1 should remain the task of family and Church and of the organizations to which these,in part,entrust it. Further than this unfortunately unanimity with regard to some very important points does not extend,even among professing Christians.

First of all there are no few ,more especially, in the circle of the Churches and Christian schools,who underestimate the dangerous situation caused by secularism and even among those who are alive to the critical position of Christianity inWestemEurope,one can distinghuish two currents of opinion.The greatmajority of those whose eyes are opened to the serious signs ofthe times,has little trust in pedagogic measures as a means of resistance,especially when these are based on the deliberate study of pedagogics and psychology.In these more or less conservative circles men count more on the tradition which has grown out of centuries of experience and the desire to continue that which has thus been

found by intuition and carried out in practice,Here,anyhow to a certain extent,the controversy over the possibility or the reverse of scholarship based on Christian principles,which appears repeatedly in other sections,also plays a part.

As against this considerable majority,a small group of specialists represent the conviction that in Christian education during the last centuries - in that proceeding from the family as well as,more directly,from the Church - there have been serious shortcomings,which they believe to be more clearly visible today than has previously been possible .Also ,though they do not overestimate the forces that go out from family and Church in the midst of a society which,broadly speaking,shows such clear signs of de-Christianization as does that of today,they are convinced 1.that the most important task of Christianity is to hand down that treasure of the ages which it has received from the generations of old in such language and in such a way as truly to reach the youth of our time;and 2.that at the moment insufficient time,attention and energy are given by Christianity to this task.

We believe ourselves to be relieved of the duty of outlining this conviction in greater detail,since,with regard to it,we can point to the contributions made by our colleague Kohnstamm in the preparatory work for Section IV of the Conference.[3)]

7. This Commission,without wishing to take sides in this controversy,is of opinion that in the existing condition

Note 3.See Ph.Kohnstamm „Die Erziehungsaufgabe der Kirche in der heutigen Welt",Jan.1937,and „Wesen und Mission Christlicher Erziehung" ,May 1937.

of affairs the following conclusions may be arrived at.

The greatest service which the Oxford Conference can render to Christianity with regard to the Educational problem,would be to clear our minds on the subject.The Conference must let no doubts remain as to the-humanly speaking - critical situation of Christianity in the Eyropean and American civilizations,and must,above all,define its position with regard to the rejection of psychological and pedagogic methods,on the grounds already given or of a strong re-forming of traditional ways of education in Christian circles,on the ground among others of what has been found by Christians with the aid of scientific methods of research.If the Conference chooses the path last mentioned it will take the first step into a very vast field,still hardly explored,a field so vast that no single land,no single Church can encompass it and of which alone the Una Sancta labouring with one mind and heart in the strength of the Lord,may venture the reclaiming.

In his notes of February 1937 Dr.Oldham says,with reference to this problem (p.3):„It may thus be that from a consideration of the educational problem strong reinforcement may come for the proposal which,on other grounds as well,is likely to be made to the Oxford Conference for the devvlopment of an ecumenical organ for research,i.e.for the enlisting as far as possible the ablest minds in a study of the problems which confront the Church throughout the world and for making the results of such study progressively available for those who have to guide the policy of the individual Churches".

We subscribe fully to these words and would add in

support of them the considerations which follow.

In the questions treated under numbers I,2,3 and 5 the Church and the Christian family are not on their own ground. We have here to do with spheres in which forces outside Christianity have a preponderating influence, which at best, can only be conquered after long effort. In this sphere the voice of the Churches and its ministers is, at best, only one among many. In the educational world things are actually not very different; that would be impossible in this age which is under the power of sin. But there is a relative difference, which is very important. The most powerful educational influence - even in a totalitarian State which is inimical to Christ - is and always will be that of the Christian family and the Church to which it belongs. This, at the same time, implies that the most serious faults here committed, were and are the faults of Christians. It must be more easy to come to repentance and reform in this domain than in those where an appeal to Jesus Christ would not be understood and would arouse opposition rather than readiness to listen.

Therefore the sphere of education is more than any other spoken of in this connection as that where the Una Sancta can give fruitful leadership, so that its followers may not falter but put their hand firmly to the plough.

Note 4. Compare. Appendix A at the end of the contributory articles.

SECTION V

THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH AND THE WORLD OF NATIONS.

1. Reflections over the Una Sancta and the World of nations take their place in the tension between the claims of the Kingdom of God and attempts to realise these claims on earth; which attempts, concerning this subject, take of necessity the form of positive law.

2. The scholastic system of the Roman Catholic Church in the Middle Ages had, as we have indicated in the Introduction, attempted to bridge over this tension by assuming a sort of gradual ascent from nature to grace; an assumption which was based on the entelechie theory of Aristotle as Christianised by St. Thomas Aquinas.

3. The harmony of this Roman Catholic system broke up in the period of the Reformation and of Humanism. On the side of the Reformation the relation of nature and grace was experienced anew in its full tension and the scholastic theory of natural law was rejected, whilst the justice of God was accepted as a demand upon the whole structure of human life. On the side of Humanism either political strife was robbed of moral and religious values (Machiavelli) or subordinated to the claims of the individual Christian conscience (Erasmus). Since Mediaeval Scholasticism men have failed entirely to find again a fundamental relation of whatever sort between the Una Sancta to the World of Nations.

4. The history of modern times is that of the period of a society of sovereign states, which in the last resort are based on the principle of power and only in a very incomplete and self-contradictory way submit to the higher authority of international law ; owing to

this,the right to wage war in particular is still a very uncertain factor in that law.War has more and more with the progress of time developed into a complete deploying of power, and thus ,in our own times,has become the problem which overshadows all other problems of international law.

5. However fruitful it might be for a far-off future,the secularised natural law ofGrotius and his school (in a certain sense a further development of the principles laid down by Erasmus) could not for a century or two be a strong counterpoise to this development.

6. After the publication in the course of the last few centuries of several plans,of a theoretically rational,in part utopian character,for a more complete cooperation between Nations,and after the failture of some practical attempts in this direction (such as the Holy Alliance) the League of Nations has since the Great War constituted the first attempt to organise systematic international cooperation in a policy based on principles of right.The State doctrine of power and the principle of right incorporated in the World of Nations ,remained however unreconciled.

7. The Churches have only to a limited extent taken a definite position in face of this development.Some Churches have in a general way supported the League of Nations and its policy without, as a rule,giving prominence to what is specifically Christian in the principles underlying this policy.Other Churches have occupied themselves exclusively with the problem of (unilateral) disarmament,seen especially from the Christian standpoint.A few sects and also individual servants of religion in the Churches have expressed their views on the question of conscientious objection

to military service.

8. One must not study Holy Scripture as a manual of international law. Since the Revelation in Christ law as God's command and the law as a system for the regulation of social justice are separated for all times. This involves for the Una Sancta a strict abstention from any legal codification of the claims made by the order of creation. On the other hand, owing to the absence of any philosophy generally accepted Christianity cannot feel itself bound by a system of international law which needs such a philosophy to make it binding. Thus it is necessary to follow the development of positive law and try to bring it more and more into line with the demands of justice.

EXPLANATION.

The Mediaeval natural law was not derived from Revelation by the Scholastics, though in the last resort it was based on the reason of God. Also, as has been said, it was brought into an ordered relation to grace and supported by the authority of the Roman Catholic Church. In this system of natural law legitimate war was justified under three conditions:

1. Auctoritas legitima.
2. Justa causa (breach of law).
3. Recta intentio (limiting the aims of war to redress and the punishment of injustice).

Since the break down of the Mediaeval Roman Catholic system it has been impossible for the Una Sancta to return to such a system. The practical objections to it lie in the fact that it is not connected with any generally accepted system of philosophy and only in part answers to the

modern development of positive international law (of this more later).The fundamental objection to this or any similar system is based on the above mentioned ruling-out of any codification of the laws of creation.

9. The Una Sancta whilst never losing sight of a fundamental principle lying behind the League of Nations (namely the priority of international law over the will of a single State) must be careful to hold its opinion in reserve regarding the League's specific policy.By the priority of international law we do not mean the acceptance of a World State as envisaged by Kelsen,but a methodical principle of which „pacta sunt servanda" forms one of the first elements.

E X P L A N A T I O N

The impasse in which of late years the League of Nations has found itself has served to raise doubts as to whether its policy is self-evident as most fitted to promote collaboration between nations and whether the Pact of the League is at the present time the most convincing foundation for this.That which seemed at first a step in the direction of systematic collaboration between the nations now proves to be an experiment,be it an important one.

If various ways mutually differing,should now be proposed for the solving of the crisis in the League of Nations,let the Una Sancta as such refrain from identifying itself with any one or other of them.Let it keep aloof, not for tactical but for fundamental reasons,from such questions.We hope under point 13 to develop this thought further.

10.On the other hand,let the Una Sancta speak out its mind ,

both on general and particular questions,whenever necessary, wherever it is a case of Christ's commandments and let it therefore uphold with all its strength:

I. The priority of international law over the will of a single State.

II.The reprehensibility in principle of war.

Let the Church not conceive these principles as being static,for they are the outcome of divine justice,which cannot be interpreted by an abstract formula,but to which whilst itself changeless ,we must approach ever nearer in the course of historical development.For this reason the two principles stand in living relation to each other.

E X P L A N A T I O N.

The two principles referred to are based directly on the New Testament as we shall show.

I. The priority of international law does not involve rejection of the „clausula rebus sic stantibus" as a rule of law;this clausula belongs to the doctrine of the interpretation and denunciation of treaties.It ought however to be supplemented more and more by the constituting of competent authorities for the modification by peaceful means of existing treaties.The above mentioned priority certainly holds as to rejection of the one-sided denunciation of treaties,if this denunciation amounts to the denial of international law ,having its roots in demonic denial of the ordinances of God,in an arbitrary will to lay down the law for the world.Acceptance of the priority of international law on the contrary involves the peaceful settlement of all international disputes,be it through conciliation,arbitration or jurisdiction,be it on the grounds of Art.11 or 19 of the Pact of the League of Nations

The priority of international law involves at the same time the demand for a further perfecting of that law, for the claims of justice would not be satisfied if the nations strictly acknowledged the binding force of a law of nations which permanently accepted and legitimatised war. Thus it is also the task of the Una Sancta to bear its constant witness, to the end that this further perfecting may not cease to be the aim of those competent to achieve it. In this the Church may not confine itself to an appeal; it is within its capacity by, for instance, strengthening ecumenical discussion in international, national and local groups, to give a direction to public opinion, which capacity under the influence of the secularised culture of the last few centuries, it has lost with regard to mundane affairs. Thus, this newly orientated public opinion would acquire more homogeneity and certainty than has been the case hitherto. Let the Una Sancta grasp these problems not only at the top but also at their roots.

II. Although the Christian conscience at all times has rightly regarded war as a product of sin, the problem in our day has entered on a new phase. Government bears the sword on account of sin and does it obviously as well against its own subjects as against other nations. But it is precisely in virtue of its bearing of the sword that government (as such) is itself drawn into the sphere of sin whose consequences it has just been called upon to castigate. Thus the sword becomes double-edged; it can operate so as to decrease but also so as to multiply sin. If government merely uses it as a restraining force then it may help in the preservation of fallen humanity; if used as an end

in itself then the user is a rebel against God.The danger of governments falling into this sin is greater in the sphere of international relations than in that of internal affairs.

The reasons for this are as follows:

A. The political doctrine according to which States are founded on the principle of power (No. 4) has been more especially since Hegels time brought into systematic connection with the intellectual elements in the historical development of the nations.But it has existed in modern civilization since Luther,who taught it on a very special basis. It will be the particular task of ecumenical discussion to show that in the light of the Gospel the two - the doctrine of power and these intellectual elements - are incompatible.The attempt to unite them is driven to its extreme when the totalitarian and authoritarian state are united in one .Let the Una Sancta not underestimate the enormous problem raised by the whole question of war.Althaus in his Kritische Bemerkungen etc.(pub.Ecumenical Council Geneva Jan. 1937) where he attempts to place it in the life structure of history,has probably plumbed the question more deeply than has Demant in „The Tragedy of War and the Hope of Peace"(publ.id.Nov.1936) who makes it a part of the social structure .In saying which,we must however emphasise our disagreement with Althaus when he loco citato suggests that war may be an unavoidable necessity.To take such a view would be to break up God's plan of preservation and redemption and to ignore the former as far as this side of life is concerned.

B. There exists between the states no judge to decide as to the

material justice of aggression, nor a police force to check the agressor. While making all allowance for criticism of the League of Nations, let us not forget that it was instituted with a view among other things to breaking that vicious circle of alliances which has been one of the most important causes of war.

C. The temptation is thus very great for the States to ignore any principle of justice and to regard their own interests as the only valid grounds for war. This the more in that they have to watch over the interests of millions. It is the duty of Christians to demonstrate by their own actions that in the last resort these interests can be better served in a world at peace. The problem of war must not be tackled by itself but in connection with all historical, economic and social problems.

D. The modern technique of war has emancipated itself to such an extent from every possible juridical justification for war, that these very ways of exercising force - which indeed have lost all proportion to any such justification - may come to be regarded as an end in themselves and government for that reason in exercising such force be in rebellion against God.

Let us glance, by comparison, at positive law and we shall notice that the Pact of the League has actually taken a line which would make the outbreak of war, on whatever grounds it may happen, a weightier problem than that of its eventual justification. At the same time it is certain that the „justa causa" and the „recta intentio" of the Mediaeval system of law are more and more transcended by the ways in which war is waged, or, in other words, that the fact of

waging war in itself acquires greater importance than its reasons and its objects.

11. Given the reprehensibility in principle of war, it is however incorrect to put all types of war - war of aggression, of sanction, of execution, of defence - on the same level. The community of nations may, as organised, be called upon as a consequence of sin to wield the sword under bertain conditions against the individual lawbreaker. At the same time a distinction in the first place between war of aggression and every other kind of war is, from the Christian standpoint, completely justified.

E X P L A N A T I O N.

Thus it is not possible on the authority of the Gospel for Christians to regard war, under any circumstances, as forbidden, nor on the other hand, to characterise this latter point of view as an error. „Let each man be fully assured in his own mind". God alone is the Lord of the conscience. In the last resort each of us has to judge each case for himself on its merits, basing his own judgment on the Word of God. The Word of God alone is absolute in this world.

12. The Una Sancta must likewise give its testimony, should war, unhoped for, break out and it must give this testimonity to the whole world, government and citizens.

E X P L A N A T I O N.

Thus, as has been shown, the Una Sancta cannot start from abstract premises and pronounce a judgment based on casuistical distinctions. Neither may it found its testimony on the present positive law, but must use this law, merely relatively, as guidance. The religious „doublure" of pronouncements made by this world's authorities, legal or political, is not

only fundamentally incorrect but in practice highly dangerous. The Una Sancta may not limit itself to generalizations but it behooves it, on the other hand, to beware of pronouncing judgments which may be open to expert professional criticism.

It behooves the Church (as was indicated in the Explanation to No.10) to use all possible indirect influence towards the better development of positive law.

13. The future will show whether or no positive law will develop in such a way that in the event of an outbreak of war, the Una Sancta can associate itself with that positive law.

EXPLANATION.

If the Una Sancta is ever to go so far as this, it will have to be because positive law has developed in such a way that it is established permanently and unequivocably among certain civilizations and that it is of a completely convincing character to the overwhelming majority of those concerned.

As an example of a closer association having taken place in the past with positive law, we would cite the Resolution of Avignon, point 4, as follows:

„We make an urgent appeal to the several authorities of all Christian communities to state plainly that they will offer no encouragement to nor will they support any war in any way, if the government of their country has refused a bona fide offer to submit the dispute to arbitration".

One may be of opinion that this association was, in a way, premature since the rule of law to which the Resolution refers is no longer generally accepted as the criterion of a war of aggression and moreover is impracticable; but principally because insight into the problem of international

disputes has, since that time, become much more profound.

A closer association would be conceivable in the future were, for instance, the development of positive law to reach a stage at which the conception of war was limited, by no longer regarding sanctions and execution as a kind of war but rather as a peculiar modality of enforcing the law. This would be possible after limitation of armaments, the existence of a truly impartial authority for determining the aggressor and the formation of an international police force - all this in a closed and homogeneous circle of States. The causes of war, referred to under No. 10 (C and B and in part that under D) would cease to exist in such political (or juridical) constellation.

Such a closer association would by no means signify a juridification of the claims which exist in virtue of the order of creation and preservation, but rather an attempt to approach nearer to the demands of God's justice by way of historical development and of positive law.

14. In the two principles, the priority of international law and the reprehensibility, in principle of war, is the culmination of the problems facing the World of Nations in our day. Christianity, in all times and repeatedly, has taken an especial stand against the manifestations of sin, which in those special times were for their excessive cruelty, dangerous character or uselessness, considered particularly intolerable. Where the authority of international law and the power of war are world problems there, above all, has the Una Sancta in our times to strive by prayer and works for a solution to them conformable to the claims of the Kingdom of God [1].

Note 1 Compare Appendix B at the end of the contributory articles.

APPENDIX A.

According to the „Communications " of the Nederlandsche Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, the Netherlands have, out of a populalation of at the time of the last Census in 1929 7920388 or 243 per square Kilometre) 7284 elementary schools with 18557 male and 16321 female teachers (total teaching staff 34878); the number of pupils was 592294 boys and 569117 girls (total number of pupils 1161411). This gives an average of 4.8 teachers and 160 pupils per school, with 33 pupils per teacher.

It is difficult to find a useful scale by which to measure the comparative costs of education in different countries. If we now quote a few figures from the Bulletin issued in October 1932 by the International Bureau of Education and which gives the percentages borne by the costs of education to the total budget of each State, we do it under reserve, in view of the entirely different conditions in the countries in question, with regard to the possibility of reaching a clear basis for comparison:

Austria	1932	3.8 %
Belgium	1931	13.00 %
Germany	1931-1932	18.3 %
Denmark	1931-1932	20.6 %
France 193	1931-1932	12.00 %
Italy	1930-1932	6.3 %
The Netherlands	1930	22.5 %
Poland	1932-1933	14.2 %
Sweden	1931-1932	17.7 %

According to private information, the costs of elementary education in the year 1931 / 1932 were per pupil:

Germany	f. 95.90
France	f. 85.80
England	f.134.00
The Netherlands	f.105.00

APPENDIX B.

In the discussion on the subject „The Universal Church and the World of Nations" special stress is laid on war as the overshadowing problem for international law in our day. Yet it has been in no way lost sight of that there are many other most weighty questions asking for international cooperation. As regards one of the most important of these, the colonial problem, we would point to the report by a Commission appointed by the Netherlands Section of the World Alliance for Promoting Friendship among the Churches, where, among other subjects, are treated the problems of colonization and the distribution of raw materials (reproduced in „Internationaal Christendom" 1936, No.3):

„The possession of a colonial empire is not, in point of fact, by any means a solution of cases of dire necessity. It is still but a primitive search in a „horizontal" direction (Rathenau). It can only then be of importance for the mother country if, at the same time, a number of other conditions are fulfilled. The sources of wealth in a colonial empire ought to be linked up with those of the mother country and the two together fitted well in to the total economic relations of the world. Every measure taken to further the placing of the sources of wealth at the service of, as far as possible, all nations and all men, must have our support.

Consciousness of our dependence as creatures involves

this conviction:

a. that no man is entitled to dominion over another; we have to serve God in serving our neighbour and our only consideration must be his good. When and in so far as this last, on account of sin, involves the exercise of authority, such authority must be constituted by and limited to this demand;

b. that we possess as not possessing this world's goods; that they are entrusted to us as stewards, that is to say, to use for the benefit of God their Owner, to Whom we are responsible, and for His creatures among whom our lot is cast".

„ECCLESIA"
KONINGINNEGRACHT 70
THE HAGUE - HOLLAND